



G. Trenholm Walker
 Thomas P. Gressette, Jr.
 Ian W. Freeman
 John P. Linton, Jr.
 Charles P. Summerall, IV

THOMAS P. GRESSETTE, JR.
 Direct: 843.727.2249
 Email: Gressette@WGFLAW.com

July 13, 2020

Via Electronic Filing and US Mail

The Honorable Jocelyn Boyd
 Chief Clerk and Administrator
 South Carolina Public Service Commission
 101 Executive Center Dr., Suite 100
 Columbia, SC 29210-8411

RE: Docket No. 2014-346-WS, Letter from Mr. Bateman dated July 10, 2020

Dear Ms. Boyd:

I represent Daufuskie Island Utility Company, Inc. ("DIUC"). On Friday afternoon we received a copy of correspondence to the Clerk from Mr. Bateman, counsel for the Office of Regulatory Staff in the above-referenced matter.

In sum, the letter asserts that DIUC's June 16, 2020, prefiling of Exhibit JFG-RR7 to the Second Rehearing Direct Testimony of John F. Guastella has triggered S.C. Code § 58-5-240's notice considerations. However, S.C. Code § 58-5-240(B) only applies immediately following the initiation of a rate proceeding pursuant to S.C. Code § 58-5-240(A). The type of "schedule" referenced in § 58-5-240(B) was filed by DIUC in 2015.

The letter also asserts that Exhibit JFG-RR7 sets forth a new rate request that exceeds the rates included in DIUC's Application. That is not accurate. DIUC's Application requested total revenue of \$2,267,689. *See* Application at Schedule W-F.1 and Schedule S-F.1. As DIUC has maintained throughout the past three years of remand proceedings, that total revenue amount (often referred to by its 108.9% increase to existing rates) is the limit on what DIUC may recover in this proceeding, because that is the amount of total increase included in DIUC's Application. ORS has not previously objected to this analysis that the maximum rate relief available in this case is limited by the total revenue amount in the Application, nor has ORS ever asserted the various tariff proposals (like Exhibit JFG-RR7) filed with the Commission throughout this case trigger S.C. Code § 58-5-240's notice considerations.¹

¹ Even if there were a notice issue, all three Daufuskie Island POAs intervened in this matter and, as such, are deemed to have actual notice of all filings in the docket.

Gressette to Hon. Boyd
July 13, 2020
Page 2 of 2

DIUC wishes to proceed as efficiently and possible toward the third hearing for this matter, which is scheduled for September 3, 2020. If the Commission requires anything in advance of that date from DIUC or counsel, please do not hesitate to contact me by telephone or by email.

Sincerely,

/s/

Thomas P. Gressette, Jr.

cc: David Butler, Esq. (David.Butler@psc.sc.gov)
Randall Dong, Esq. (Randall.Dong@psc.sc.gov)
Andrew M. Bateman, Esq. (abateman@regstaff.sc.gov)
Jeff Nelson, Esq. (jnelson@regstaff.sc.gov)
John J. Pringle, Jr., Esq. (jack.pringle@arlaw.com)
John F. Beach, Esq. (john.beach@arlaw.com)